



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/256,346	02/24/1999	KEN-ICHI TAKATORI	Q053397	9700

7590 04/04/2005

SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACPEAK & SEAS  
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE N W  
WASHINGTON, DC 200377060

EXAMINER
----------

NELSON, ALECIA DIANE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2675

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/256,346

Applicant(s)

TAKATORI ET AL.

Examiner

Alecia D. Nelson

Art Unit

2675

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 28 February 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.


3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 16-19.Claim(s) objected to: 5, 6, 8/5/3/2/1, 9/6/5/3/2/1.Claim(s) rejected: 1-4, 7-15.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
SUMATI LEFKOWITZ  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues the rejection as applied to claims 1-4 and 7-9 are directed towards the combination of references failing to teach simultaneously resetting the scan lines in the first field after the scan lines are successively scanned in the first field and simultaneously resetting the scan lines in the second field after the scan lines are successively scanned in the second field. As explained in the office action neither reference specifically teach simultaneously resetting the scan lines after being scanned. However, in the combination of the references, the scanning period and the erasure period occur in the same order as the claimed invention, just not in the same field. As stated in the office action the simultaneous erase step still functions to reset the scan lines scanned prior. However, as also explained in the office action, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to allow the reset period, from the start of the sub-frame as taught by Okada, to be at the end of the subframe (see page 4 of Office action 11/29/04). Further the applicant argues with reference to claims 10-15 that the references fail to teach writing data a plurality of times in the scan line in the first field by use of a data signal having a period corresponding to the frame wherein the signal has a first signal voltage during the first field and a second signal voltage opposite the first signal voltage being applied in a second field. Ito teaches these limitations as explained in the office action (see page 6 of Office action 11/29/04). Further the applicant states that the examiner has misconstrued the teachings of Ito wherein the "reversal period" and "polarity of the voltage applied to the display elements" refers to the scanning signals and not the data signals. However the cited portion was included to teach with reference to the scanning signals and not the data signals. For the reasons given above the final rejection will be maintained..